

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 13-17, 19-21, 23-50, and 52-82 are pending in this Application. Claims 1-10, 30-39, and 59-73 are currently withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, claims 13, 17, 19-20, 24-28, 40, 42, 49, 53-58, and 77-82 have been amended, and claim 18 is canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 13, 15-19, 40-42, 44-50, 52, 54-58, and 74-75 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kuno (U.S. Patent No. 5,467,102); rejects claims 20-21, 23, 25-29, 49-50, 52, 54-58, and 76-82 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas (U.S. Patent No. 5,499,330) in view of Cassorla (U.S. Patent No. 5,146,552); rejects claims 14 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuno in view of Failla (U.S. Patent No. 5,128,662); and rejects claims 24 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas in view of Cassorla and further in view of Technology Update, Wordperfect Corporation Introduces Wordperfect 6.0 for DOS (http://www.nfbnet.org/files/word_processing/WP60.TXT; hereinafter "Wordperfect"). To the extent that these rejections remain applicable to the claims, as amended, the Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, as follows.

A. Claims 13, 40, and 42

Regarding the rejection of claims 13, 40, and 42, the Applicant respectfully asserts that Kuno, Lucas, Cassorla, Failla, and Wordperfect, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for displaying at least one selected page of an electronic book displayed on a viewer having at least the combination of a plurality of hardware screens, each capable of being physically and electrically attached to each other in a plurality of geometric

configurations and separated from each other so as not to be in contact with each other, as recited in amended claim 13 and similarly recited in amended claims 40 and 42.

Kuno, in col. 3, lines 28-29, 54-66, with reference to Figs. 1 and 2A-B, merely discloses a display device 100 including display screen units 1 and 2 that are attached together by a hinge 3. Further, Kuno discloses that the display screen units 1 and 2 can be folded up, face to face or back to back with each other. Kuno also discloses that a switch mechanism for detecting such a folding of the display screen units 1 and 2, and erasing the display on one of the display screen units 1 and 2 that is to be a back side. Kuno, however, fails to disclose at least the combination of features recited in claims 13, 40, and 42, as amended.

Lucas, Cassorla, Failla, and Wordperfect, in combination with Kuno, as cited by the Examiner, also fail to disclose or suggest at least the combination of features recited in amended claims 13, 40, and 42, and therefore, fail to make up for the deficiencies of Kuno.

For at least the above reason, the Applicant submits that claims 13, 40, and 42, as amended, are allowable over the cited references. As claims 13, 40, and 42 are allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 14-19, 41, 43-48, and 74-75, which depend from claims 13, 40, and 42, respectively, are likewise allowable over the cited references.

B. Claims 20, 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57

Regarding the rejection of claims 20, 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57, the Applicant respectfully asserts that Lucas, Cassorla, Kuno, Failla, and Wordperfect, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for simultaneously displaying on a viewer a selected portion of an electronic book and content from a plurality of separate information sources, as recited in amended claim 20 and similarly recited in amended claims 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57.

Lucas merely discloses a document display system for organizing and displaying documents as screen objects organized along strand paths. Lucas, however, fails to disclose at least the combination of features recited in claims 20, 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57, as amended.

Cassorla, Kuno, Failla, and Wordperfect in combination with Lucas, as cited by the Examiner, also fail to disclose or suggest at least the combination of features recited in amended claims 20, 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57, and therefore, fail to make up for the deficiencies of Lucas.

For at least the above reason, the Applicant submits that claims 20, 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57, as amended, are allowable over the cited references. As claims 20, 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57 are allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 21, 23, 25-27, 29, 50, 52, 54-56, 58, and 76-82, which depend from claims 20, 28, 49, and 57, respectively, are likewise allowable over the cited references.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 13-17, 19-21, 23-29, 40-50, 52-58, and 74-82 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 026880-00020.

Respectfully submitted,



Bogdan A. Zinchenko
Registration Number 57,473

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

BAZ/hs

Attachment: Petition for Extension of Time